

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 24-26, and 32 have been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of the claimed invention. Claims 1-33 have been amended to conform to common U.S. practice. Claims 1-33 remain pending in the present application.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 11-23 as well as the indication of allowability of claims 5-10 if rewritten to include the features of their base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-3 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by PCT 99/36795 to Krasner ("Krasner"). Claims 1 and 26, as amended, include the feature of "said modification allowing said first subunit to remain fully operational." Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 8, lines 28-32, page 10, lines 29-32, and page 14, lines 10-16.

In contrast, Krasner teaches blocking the satellite positioning system signals from the receiver (See Abstract). Krasner blocks the signals by turning off "switch 112 . . . so that no data is passed through to the GPS receiver. Thus GPS signals are gated out (or blocked) during cellular telephone transmissions at high power." See page 10, second paragraph of Krasner. As noted at page 4 of the present application, by blocking signals as taught in Krasner, "the synchronization of the GPS receiver subunit to the satellite may be lost during a long lasting data or voice transmitter signal outputted from the GSM transceiver subunit." Therefore, Krasner does not teach or suggest allowing "said first subunit to remain fully operational" as recited in claims 1 and 26. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 1 and 26 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3 and 27-28 are either directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 or 26 respectively. As such, claims 2-3 and 27-28 should not be anticipated by Krasner for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2-3 and 27-28 be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 24-25, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,427 to Hughes ("Hughes"). Claim 4 is indirectly

dependent from claim 1 and is not taught by Krasner for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, the combination of Krasner and Hughes does not teach or suggest "said modification allowing said first subunit to remain fully operational." Hughes has been cited merely for the purpose of teaching "a low noise amplifier having at least two modes of operation," as stated at page 3 of the Office Action. Hughes does not teach modifying an operation mode of a first subunit, and therefore also does not teach that the modification allows the first subunit to remain fully operational. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is not taught or suggested by the Krasner and Hughes combination and request that the §103 rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Similarly, claims 29-31 are indirectly dependent from claim 26 and are therefore not taught by Krasner for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 26. In addition, as set forth above, the Krasner and Hughes combination does not teach or suggest the feature of "said modification allowing said first subunit to remain fully operational." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 29-31 be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 24-25, these claims have been amended to recited the feature of "said modification allowing said first subunit to remain fully operational" and therefore, these claims are not taught or suggested by the Krasner and Hughes combination for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 4 and 29-31. As such, applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 24-25 be withdrawn.

Claims 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner. Claim 32 has been amended in a manner similar to that of claims 1 and 24-26 and should not be taught or suggested by Krasner for at least the same reasons as stated above. Claim 33 is directly dependent from claim 32 and should not be taught or anticipated for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 32. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 32-33 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the thorough reconsideration of this application and earnestly solicits an early notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST,
A Professional Corporation



Ashley N. (Farris) Moore
Reg. No. 51,667

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799
(214) 965-7393
(214) 855-4300 (fax)